

REMARKS

Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 32 recites a polishing pad made of resin material, and examiner's suggestion regarding grammatical insertion of "a" after the term "via" is incorporated. Unnecessary and confusing language "be placed on" is removed from the claim.. The term "gate-shaped" is defined by the claim language immediately following the term; namely having a shape with two legs opposed to each other with a spacing therebetween and a cross rail extending between and being perpendicular to said two legs. This language is also used in the body of the specification to describe the shape of the column. (See paragraph 0065, line 9). However, to further clarify that the claim language describes the shape of the column, the phrase "of a shape" has been inserted into the claim to modify gate-shaped column. The tooth width, wedge angle and clearance angle terms characterize the "cutting part". The numerical apparatus is for controlling an operation of a drive motor. Typographical errors have been corrected. Rejection of claim 32 for indefiniteness is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 33 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The term "chips" is further elucidated in the claim language and the specification as polishing pad fragments that are produced when the polishing pad is cut. (See paragraph 0091). Since the term "chips" is properly defined and introduced in the claim, there is no lack of antecedent basis and rejection of the claim on that ground is improper and should be withdrawn. No new material has been added, rather clarifying language has been included.

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The examiner expressed confusion as to whether the claimed milling cutter unit or drill unit is the same as the fixed tool of claim 32. The milling cutter unit, the drill unit and the fixed tool of claim 32 are all separate and distinct devices. The fixed tool of claim 32, as described in claim 32, comprises a turning tool that in turn comprises a cutting part with the parameters set forth in claim 32. The fixed tool of claim 32 is also described in the specification in paragraphs [0095] - [0099]. In contrast the milling cutter unit is described in the specification in paragraph [0101]. Because the two devices have distinguishing terms and definitions, rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C.112, second paragraph as lacking antecedent basis for the milling cutter. Claim 35 depends on Claim 34 which recites a milling cutter unit. The wedge angle, tooth width and rake angle ranges pertain to the cutting edges of the milling cutter of the milling cutter unit, not the cutting part of the turning tool of the fixed tool of claim 32. Therefore rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as lacking antecedent basis for the term "center axes". Claim 36 recites a tool shaft that extends through "center holes" of a plurality of milling cutters. Claim 36 is dependent on claim 35 which recites a milling cutter including a disk-shaped body member with a center hole formed therethrough; thereby providing an antecedent basis for "center holes". No new material has been added. Therefore, rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The examiner finds claim 37 unclear because it recites a drill unit and claim 32 recites a fixed tool. Claim 37 depends on claim 34 which further describes the tool rest of claim 32 as supporting, in addition to the fixed tool of claim 32, a rotative tool that can be either a milling cutter unit or a drill unit. Because claim 34 provides the proper basis for the drill unit, rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because it inherits the deficiencies of the base claim. However, because rejection of claim 32 is improper and should be withdrawn, rejection of claim 38 is also improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 40 recites "a rotative tool", which is in proper form. Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance, notice of which is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

Marc A. Rossi
Registration No. 31,923

Attorney Docket No. KASA:019

ROSSI & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 826
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020